



Docket No. 15-UL-5580

Applicant: Charles C. Brackett : Group Art Unit: 2134
Serial No.: 09/667,742 : Examiner: Heneghan, M.E.
Filed: September 22, 2000 : Date: July 22, 2005
Title: ULTRASOUND IMAGING SYSTEM
HAVING VIRUS PROTECTION

Hon. Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, VA 22313

TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Sir:

Transmitted herewith for filing in the above-identified application is an Amendment After Final Rejection.

FEE FOR ADDITIONAL CLAIMS

☒ A fee for additional claims is not required.

☐ A fee for additional claims is required. The additional fee has been calculated as shown below:

	CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT		HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR		NUMBER OF EXTRA CLAIMS	RATE	ADDITIONAL FEE
TOTAL CLAIMS:	18	-	29	=	0	x \$50 =	0
INDEPENDENT CLAIMS:	2	-	3	=	0	x \$200 =	0
TOTAL FEE DUE						\$	0


☐ Our check for payment of the additional claims fee is enclosed.

☐ Please charge \$_____ to Deposit Account No. 07-0845 in payment of the fee.

☒ The Commissioner is authorized to charge payment of any extension or other fee under 37 CFR 1.16 or 1.17 which may be required by this paper or credit any overpayment of same to Deposit Account No. 07-0845.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicant


Dennis M. Flaherty
Reg. No. 31,159
Ostrager Chong Flaherty &
Broitman P.C.
250 Park Avenue, Suite 825
New York, NY 10177
(212) 681-0600
(212) 681-0300 (fax)



Atty. Docket: 15-UL-5580

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Charles C. Brackett : Group Art Unit: 2134
Serial No.: 09/667,742 : Examiner: Heneghan, M.E.
Filed: September 22, 2000
Title: ULTRASOUND IMAGING SYSTEM
HAVING VIRUS PROTECTION

Hon. Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO FINAL REJECTION

Sir:

In response to the Final Rejection dated May 3, 2005, the Applicant submits the following argument for reconsideration of the non-obviousness of the invention being claimed in the instant patent application.

ARGUMENT

In ¶ 3 of the office action, claims 1, 4, 8, 9, 11-13, 30-32, and 34-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,269,379 to Hiyama *et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,694,434 to McGee *et al.* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,319,776 to Hile *et al.* The Applicant traverses this ground for rejection for the following reasons.

Both of independent claims 1 and 30 recite limitations not found in any of the three cited patents, namely, that a registry file contains encrypted data representing a list of